GA 1.13:CED-82-55

546-D

BY THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Report To The Honorable James H. Weaver House Of Representatives

COMPLETED 42

Information On Corps Of Engineers Deauthorization Program For Water Projects

The 1974 Water Resources Development Act (Public Law 93-251) requires the Secretary of the Army to submit annually to the Congress a list of authorized but unneeded water resources projects recommended for deauthorization. The recommended projects must not have received any appropriations during the last 8 years. Since 1974, 453 of the 877 eligible projects were deauthorized as a result of Corps of Engineers reviews. The total cost of administering this program is about $1.3 million.

CED-82-55
MARCH 23, 1982

I

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are $3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are $1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

B-206437

The Honorable James H. Weaver
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Weaver:

On June 25, 1981, you and seven other Members of Congress--Berkley W. Bedell, Robert W. Edgar, Floyd J. Fithian, Barney Frank, Ronald E. Paul, Buddy Roemer, and John Seiberling--requested that we provide information on possible unneeded water resources projects. In subsequent meetings with your office and the other requestors, we agreed to review the current Corps of Engineers deauthorization program for water projects as prescribed in the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, Public Law 93-251, dated March 7, 1974. As agreed with the other requestors, we have addressed the report to you and are sending copies to them.

In this report we explain the Corps' implementation of the deauthorization program and its results and costs and we provide Corps comments on the advantages, disadvantages, and possible changes to the program. Of the 877 projects eligible for deauthorization from March 7, 1974, to December 1, 1981, 453 have been deauthorized at a cost of about $1.3 million. In essence, Corps officials told us that they saw no need for revisions to the existing deauthorization process because they believed the program, as implemented, has accomplished what was intended by the legislation. Appendix I shows 78 projects that were eligible but not deauthorized in the seven Corps districts we visited.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to obtain specific information on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers deauthorization program. This included information on the (1) legislative history of the program, (2) Corps' implementing criteria, policies, and procedures for the program, and (3) process used by the Corps and its results in deauthorizing water projects. To determine how the program was being administered throughout the Corps, we selected locations on the east and west coasts and the midwest. We then reviewed records and held discussions with officials from Corps headquarters, Washington, D.C.; Corps division offices in Atlanta,

Georgia, and San Francisco, California; and Corps district offices in Jacksonville, Florida; Kansas City and St. Louis, Missouri; Los Angeles and San Francisco, California; Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Wilmington, North Carolina.

At each Corps district office visited, we reviewed various information and data on authorized water projects to determine whether the district had identified and reported all eligible projects. In addition, we discussed the deauthorization program with district personnel to better understand how the deauthorization review process works and to resolve questions about the eligibility of certain projects. We then summarized the reasons why projects were or were not deauthorized. We also obtained from the Corps the amount of funds spent on considering projects for deauthorization.

We interviewed Corps officials in headquarters and the districts to obtain their views on the advantages and disadvantages of the current deauthorization program and to discuss some possible changes. No attempt was made to evaluate their comments. We made this review in accordance with GAO's current "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions."

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE DEAUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

In 1974 the Congress enacted legislation 1/ that provided a means for removing water resources projects from the list of authorized but unconstructed projects. According to Public Law 93-251, section 12, as amended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may recommend to the Congress that projects be deauthorized if they have been authorized at least 8 years but have received no appropriations for the last 8 years. The legislation requires the Corps to review projects according to specific procedures before recommending that they be deauthorized. Projects can also be deauthorized by other means. For example, the Congress can enact special legislation to deauthorize projects at any time, regardless of whether they meet specific eligibility criteria. A recent example is Public Law 97-128, 95 Stat. 1681, enacted December 29, 1981, which deauthorized several Corps of Engineers water resources projects.

1/Water Resources Development Act of 1974, Public Law 93-251, 88 Stat. 16, sec. 12, Mar. 7, 1974, 33 U.S.C. 579. As amended by Public Law 94-587, 90 Stat. 2933, sec. 157, Oct. 22, 1976, 33 U.S.C. 579.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

The following excerpts from a report of the House Committee on Public Works 1/ explain why deauthorization legislation was needed for Corps of Engineers projects.

> "Many water resources development projects become after they are authorized, inappropriate for one reason or another. Changing economic conditions may render them uneconomic. Population and industrial growth may make them inadequate to serve new needs. The local interests may decide they do not want a project. Yet, in all of these cases, unless the time consuming process of obtaining specific Congressional deauthorization through an Act of Congress is followed, the project remains authorized, is considered part of the backlog of authorized but unconstructed projects, and continues to discourage homeowners and landowners in the project area from maintaining much less improving, their property."
>
> * * * * *
>
> "This section fulfills a very real need for a means to remove from the books projects which are not needed or justified, while at the same time providing ample congressional review and final decisionmaking authority."

Before submitting to the Congress a list of projects recommended for deauthorization, the Chief of Engineers is required to (1) obtain views from interested Federal departments, agencies and instrumentalities, and the Governors of affected States and (2) notify each Senator and Congressman in whose State or district a project is located. In addition, the Chief of Engineers must furnish these comments to the Congress with the recommended list. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works or the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation may adopt a resolution to continue authorization of any project on the deauthorization list within 90 days of continuous congressional session. Those projects are removed from the list of projects being considered for deauthorization and, pursuant to the statute, can never be again considered under it. All projects not removed from the list by resolution within 90 days are deauthorized with no further action required.

1/Report of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on the Water Resources Development Act of 1973 and River Basin Monetary Authorization of 1973, Rept. No. 93-541, Oct. 3, 1973, pp. 90 and 91.

DEAUTHORIZATION REVIEW PROCESS

Public Law 93-251 requires the Chief of Engineers to review and submit to the Congress annually a list of authorized projects which should no longer be authorized. The Corps' Engineer Regulation 1105-2-82, dated September 15, 1975, and amendments, specify current policies and procedures for identifying eligible projects and for conducting these reviews. Following is a summary of how district officials identify projects eligible for deauthorization and the procedures they follow in reviewing the projects to determine those which should be deauthorized.

The first step is to identify projects which have been authorized for at least 8 years but which have had no funding for advance engineering and design or construction in the last 8 years. Typically, district officials identify projects as eligible for deauthorization about 2 years in advance so they can budget funds to review the project in the fiscal year it becomes eligible. If the Congress does not appropriate funds for that purpose, no deauthorization review is made and the project remains authorized.

The regulation states that, as a matter of policy, deauthorization reviews should be conducted to the extent necessary to determine whether a project should continue to be authorized. However, it points out that a deauthorization review is not intended to affirm the viability of a project as authorized or to reformulate the authorized project to meet current needs. Typically, district officials solicit comments from interested parties--particularly local interests responsible for providing the requirements of local cooperation--regarding the proposed deauthorization. In some instances, the officials solicit comments only from the project sponsors. In other instances, they send notices asking for comments on the proposed deauthorization to the public that is affected by or interested in the project, including the local media.

If the public response indicates opposition to deauthorization, the Corps may hold a public meeting. The purpose of a public meeting is to (1) inform the public about the proposed deauthorization, (2) give interested persons an opportunity to publicly express their views concerning the proposed deauthorization, and (3) assist district officials in determining if a project should be recommended for deauthorization. Generally, local opposition, particularly opposition by local project sponsors, is sufficient to preclude district officials from recommending deauthorization. However, these officials sometimes recommend deauthorizing a project after considering arguments against deauthorization.

District officials submit projects recommended for deauthorization to the Office, Chief of Engineers, which coordinates the recommendations with State and Federal agency officials. Based upon comments received, the Chief of Engineers may withdraw projects from the list recommended for deauthorization. Projects withdrawn by the Chief of Engineers remain eligible for deauthorization, but there is no requirement that they be reconsidered periodically for deauthorization. After the Chief of Engineers review, the list of projects recommended for deauthorization is submitted to the Secretary of the Army, who in turn forwards it to the Congress. Even after the list is submitted to the Congress, the Secretary of the Army may remove projects from the list anytime before the close of 90 days of continuous congressional session. However, the Secretary of the Army has never removed a project from the list after submitting it to the Congress. Projects submitted to the Congress are deauthorized at the end of 90 days of continuous congressional session unless either the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works or the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopts a resolution stating that particular projects shall continue to be authorized. Projects removed from the list by resolution can never be considered again for deauthorization under section 12.

The following is a brief illustration of how the process worked for the Keach Drainage and Levee District project in Illinois. District officials initially determined that this project was eligible for deauthorization and in March 1976 notified interested parties by public notice of the proposed deauthorization. Parties notified included local, State, and Federal officials; State and county agencies; and various newspapers and radio and television stations in the surrounding area. The district received numerous comments from interested parties opposing deauthorization and, because of the amount of interest, district officials scheduled a public meeting. Ten individuals, representing county officials, landowners, and area residents, attended the meeting and as a group opposed deauthorization. District officials considered the comments received and decided against recommending deauthorization.

DEAUTHORIZATION RESULTS

Corps records show that from March 7, 1974, to December 1, 1981, 877 projects 1/ were identified as eligible for possible deauthorization. District officials recommended deauthorizing 516 projects, or approximately 60 percent of the number eligible. The Chief of Engineers withdrew district recommendations on 13

1/Includes authorized projects, project modifications separately authorized, or project elements that the Corps has identified as a separate project.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

projects because of State opposition, leaving 503 projects for congressional action. Of the 503 projects recommended, 453 were deauthorized and the Congress adopted resolutions to continue authorization of the remaining 50. Through fiscal year 1981, the Corps spent about $1.3 million (see pp. 9 and 10) on reviewing projects considered for deauthorization.

The above data shows that as of December 1, 1981, 374 projects (877 eligible, less 453 deauthorized, less 50 continued by resolution) remained eligible for possible deauthorization. The Corps' Engineer Pamphlet 1105-2-82, dated December 1, 1981, lists 323 projects as currently eligible for deauthorization review. The Assistant Chief of Planning Division, Civil Works, at Corps headquarters told us that he could not readily account for a difference of 51 projects. He did point out that some of these projects have been funded and are no longer eligible for deauthorization. Also, the pamphlet lists an additional 280 projects that tentatively have been identified as eligible for deauthorization which are now being verified.

Four hundred and fifty-three projects were deauthorized from six annual reports; 61 percent of these projects were deauthorized from the first report. The following shows the number of projects deauthorized from each report.

Annual report	Date deauthorized (note a)	Projects eligible	Projects recommended	Projects deauthorized	Percent of total deauthorized
First	Aug. 5, 1977	796	332	275	61
Second	Nov. 6, 1977	27	c/45	44	10
Third	Oct. 3, 1978	(b)	c/40	40	9
Fourth	Nov. 2, 1979	(b)	c/60	57	12
Fifth	May 6, 1981	40	24	23	5
Sixth	Nov. 2, 1981	14	c/15	14	3
Total		877	516	453	100

a/Deauthorized after 90 days of continuous congressional session.

b/No projects were identified by the Corps as eligible for the year.

c/The projects recommended for deauthorization were identified from previous years.

REASONS WHY PROJECTS WERE DEAUTHORIZED

Within the seven Corps districts included in our review, 50 of 136 projects which Corps officials identified as eligible were

deauthorized. District officials recommended that projects be deauthorized for various reasons; for many projects the recommendations were based on several reasons. The following table summarizes what Corps records show to be the most significant reason for deauthorizing each of the 50 projects.

Reasons given for recommending deauthorization	No. of projects deauthorized	Percent
Lack of local interest	19	38
Need no longer exists	18	36
Benefit-cost ratio below unity (costs exceed benefits)	6	12
Lack of local assurance	5	10
Superseded by another project	2	4
Total	50	100

Lack of local interest. District officials recommended deauthorizing 19 projects because project sponsors and other affected parties concurred with the proposed deauthorization or did not respond to the Corps' public notice and request for comments on the proposed deauthorization. Corps records showed that three of these projects also had benefit-cost ratios below unity.

Need no longer exists. District officials recommended deauthorizing 18 projects primarily because they were no longer required. Essentially the objectives of these projects had been accomplished by local interests or through other agencies. For example, one project was completed by the Housing and Urban Development Agency without Corps involvement.

Benefit-cost ratio below unity (costs exceed benefits). District officials recommended that six projects be deauthorized because they lacked economic justification. Subsequent to project authorization, the Corps determined that all had benefit-cost ratios below unity.

Lack of local assurance. District officials recommended deauthorizing five projects because the non-Federal interests could not fulfill the required conditions of local cooperation, such as providing easements and rights-of-way. For example, a local project sponsor rescinded its assurance to provide local cooperation requirements and concurred with deauthorization.

Superseded by another project. District officials recommended deauthorizing two projects because the projects as originally authorized had been absorbed into larger, more comprehensive projects. For example, a levee project was incorporated in a flood control study encompassing a larger area.

REASONS WHY PROJECTS WERE NOT DEAUTHORIZED

Four hundred and twenty-four projects, or about 50 percent, of the 877 projects eligible for possible deauthorization during the period March 7, 1974, through December 1, 1981, were not deauthorized (877 eligible, less 453 deauthorized).

Within the seven Corps districts included in our review, district officials identified 136 projects as being eligible for possible deauthorization. We found that 8 of the 136 projects considered for possible deauthorization should not have been because they did not meet the eligibility criteria. We excluded those projects from our review, leaving 128 projects eligible for possible deauthorization. Of the 128 projects, 50 were deauthorized. The remaining 78 were not deauthorized, including 10 that the districts recommended for deauthorization but were removed by the Chief of Engineers or congressional resolution. The following table summarizes the most significant reasons why the 78 projects were not deauthorized.

Reasons given for not deauthorizing projects	No. of projects not deauthorized	Percent
Deauthorization opposed by local interest	34	44
Deauthorization action deferred pending restudy	24	31
Deauthorization review needed, scheduled, or ongoing	10	13
Authorization continued by congressional resolution	8	10
Recommendation withdrawn by the Chief of Engineers	2	2
Total	78	100

Deauthorization opposed by local interest. Thirty-four projects were not recommended because local interests responsible for providing the non-Federal share of project costs--boards of county commissioners, city councils, State agencies, levee districts, and mayors among others--opposed deauthorization. (See pp. 13 to 17.)

Deauthorization action deferred pending restudy. Twenty-four projects were not recommended because they were being restudied under the Deferred for Restudy Program or were being reconsidered

using current design criteria and costs as a part of a larger system. District officials said they wanted to withhold recommending deauthorization until the results of these studies were available. (See pp. 18 to 21.)

Deauthorization review needed, scheduled, or ongoing. District officials withheld recommending deauthorizing 10 projects because deauthorization reviews were needed but not scheduled, scheduled but not funded, or started but not completed. District officials will decide whether to recommend these projects for deauthorization when those reviews are completed. (See pp. 22 and 23.)

Authorization continued by congressional resolution. District officials recommended deauthorizing eight projects, but the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopted resolutions continuing project authorization. Pursuant to Public Law 93-251, adoption of resolutions continuing authorization bars future reconsideration of the project for deauthorization under the act. (See pp. 24 and 25.)

Recommendation withdrawn by the Chief of Engineers. Two projects recommended for deauthorization by the St. Louis district were withdrawn by the Chief of Engineers before the list was submitted to the Congress. In both instances the Chief of Engineers withdrew the recommendations to deauthorize because of opposition by the Governor or a State agency in which the project was located. (See p. 26.)

DEAUTHORIZATION COSTS

The Corps has received about $1.8 million in congressional appropriations for conducting deauthorization reviews. The largest appropriation of $650,000 was received in fiscal year 1975. The amounts appropriated have declined through fiscal year 1981, for which the Congress appropriated only $8,000. A headquarters deauthorization program analyst stated that due to staff shortages the Corps reallocated its efforts to higher priority and more productive programs. As of September 30, 1981, the Corps spent about $1.3 million of the $1.8 million, leaving a balance of about $500,000. This balance has been reprogramed within the Corps' general investigation budget appropriation, but the above official was unable to identify immediately where the reprogramed funds were spent.

The following table summarizes Corps funding requests, appropriations, and expenditures by fiscal year since fiscal year 1975.

Fiscal year	Amount requested	Amount appropriated	Amount spent
1975	$ 0	$ 650,000	$ 304,000
1976	350,000	350,000	347,000
1977	375,000	375,000	301,000
1978	150,000	150,000	130,000
1979	125,000	125,000	65,000
1980	100,000	100,000	94,000
1981	8,000	8,000	15,000
Total	$1,108,000	$1,758,000	$1,256,000

The seven Corps districts included in our review received $232,400 to conduct deauthorization reviews through fiscal year 1981. Expenditures equaled receipts in all but three districts--Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Wilmington. Los Angeles district officials spent $24,000 less than the $40,900 received; San Francisco $3,600 less than the $34,000 received; and Wilmington $2,000 less than $25,500 received. In all instances the Corps reprogramed the unspent balance.

CORPS COMMENTS ON THE DEAUTHORIZATION PROCESS

We interviewed Corps officials at headquarters and seven district offices to obtain their views on the advantages and disadvantages of the current deauthorization process and to discuss some suggested changes to the process. Typical officials interviewed were the Assistant Chief of Planning Division, Civil Works, at Corps headquarters and the Chief of the Program Development office at the Corps' St. Louis District.

All officials stated that the program has been useful in deauthorizing unneeded or unjustified projects. One district official also said that the program continues to be useful in eliminating these projects as they become eligible for consideration. Officials from headquarters and four district offices said that the primary benefit of deauthorizing projects was eliminating the recordkeeping associated with authorized projects. However, these same officials stated that most of this benefit occurred at the beginning of the program when a large backlog of projects was deauthorized. Since 1974, 453 projects were deauthorized of which 319, or about 70 percent, were from the first two annual reports of projects recommended for deauthorization. A Corps headquarters official stated that an additional benefit of deauthorizing projects is that it alleviates the uncertainty facing communities located within a project area. For example, communities may be hindered in planning for future use of the land and residents may be concerned about possible displacement from their land.

Corps officials also mentioned some negative effects of deauthorizing projects. For example, officials from headquarters and five district offices stated that conditions change over time and that projects not justified when deauthorized might be justified at a later date under the right circumstances. A headquarters official stated that a deauthorized project, which at a later date becomes justified, must be reauthorized by the Congress before advancing to the design and construction stages. According to this same official, reauthorizing a project is more time-consuming and costly than working with an existing authorization. However, he could not document how much more time-consuming or costly reauthorization is than keeping a project on the books or whether there has ever been a need to reauthorize a project. Officials in one district agreed strongly with the headquarters official's rationale for keeping unfunded projects authorized.

Corps officials commented on several possible changes to the deauthorization process including (1) adding a sunset provision to automatically deauthorize a project not funded in a specific number of years, (2) recommending projects for deauthorization when they become eligible without any deauthorization review, and (3) submitting deauthorization recommendations periodically (for example every 3 or 4 years) rather than annually. In essence, Corps officials told us that they saw no need for revisions to the existing deauthorization process because they believed the program, as implemented, has accomplished what was intended by the legislation. Corps comments on the "sunset clause" is an example of their views on suggested changes. Corps officials told us that they opposed any efforts to revise the process to incorporate sunset legislation. For example, Corps headquarters officials said that a sunset provision could force local agencies to push prematurely for construction funding based on incomplete plans in a race against an arbitrary time limit. Headquarters officials also pointed out that even with a sunset provision, it was not likely that a project would be deauthorized without a review--a condition that is part of the current process.

- - - -

As you and the other requestors asked, we did not obtain written Corps of Engineers comments on the information presented in this report. However, the information contained in this report was discussed with Corps headquarters and field officials and their comments were included where appropriate.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

As arranged with your office and the other requestors, we are sending copies of this report to the Secretaries of Defense and the Army. Copies will also be available to other interested parties upon request.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Eschwege

Henry Eschwege
Director

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

REASONS PROJECTS WERE NOT DEAUTHORIZED

Deauthorization opposed by local interest

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
00077	Keach Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	$ 3,240 (1969)	Raising and enlarging existing levee and providing other associated facilities.	At a public meeting, levee district commissioners, Greene County board of supervisors, landowners, and residents of the area opposed deauthorization.
00094	Big Swan Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	7,736 (1975)	Same as above.	At a public meeting, levee district commissioners, landowners, and residents of the area opposed deauthorization.
00037	Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	1,010 (1975)	Seepage control measures.	At a public meeting, levee district commissioners opposed deauthorization.
00069	Meredosia, Ill.	11,080 (1981)	Raising and enlarging existing levee and providing other associated facilities.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1979 and currently is not eligible for deauthorization.
00038	East Cape, Girardeau, Ill.	835 (1975)	Seepage control measures.	At a public meeting, levee commissioners opposed deauthorization.
00071	Eldred and Spanky Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	12,810 (1981)	Raising and enlarging existing levee and providing other associated facilities.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1977 and is currently not eligible for deauthorization.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
00073	Hartwell Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	$ 11,720 (1981)	Raising and enlarging existing levees and providing other associated facilities.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1978 and is currently not eligible for deauthorization.
00075	Hillview Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	11,805 (1981)	Same as above.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1979 and is currently not eligible for deauthorization.
00079	Meredosia Lake, Ill.	9,105 (1981)	Same as above.	Same as above.
00623	Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	9,190 (1981)	Same as above.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1978 and is currently not eligible for deauthorization.
72114	Scott County Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	15,400 (1981)	Same as above.	Local interests opposed deauthorization.
00088	Irondale Lake, Mo.	62,100 (1981)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Same as above.
00089	I-38 Lake, Mo.	27,600 (1981)	Same as above.	Same as above.
00091	Pine Ford Lake, Mo.	133,000 (1981)	Same as above.	Local interests opposed deauthorization. Project was funded in fiscal year 1976 and is currently not eligible for deauthorization.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
00629	Angler Use Sites, Mo.	$ 4,080 (1981)	An access and stopping-off point for hunters and fishermen.	Local interests opposed deauthorization.
74918	Douglas Lake, Kans.	71,900 (1981)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Same as above.
74924	Bonwell Lake, Okla.	204,000 (1981)	Same as above.	Same as above.
74928	Sand Lake, Okla.	26,900 (1981)	Same as above.	Same as above.
74929	Tuskahoma Lake, Okla.	78,000 (1981)	Same as above.	Same as above.
04320	Crutcho Creek, Okla.	7,230 (1972)	Enlarging channel.	Same as above.
04130	Cow Creek, Kans.	9,800 (1981)	Clearing and deepening channel.	Same as above.
74362	Cedar Keys Harbor, Fla.	170 (1965)	Clearing channel.	The Levy County, Fla., board of commissioners opposed deauthorization.
13580	Palm Beach County (Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet), Fla.	6,815 (1971)	Island sandfill.	The Palm Beach County board of commissioners opposed deauthorization.
74373	Key West Harbor (jetties in northwest channel), Fla.	22,103 (1975)	Remove coral and reefs and deepen channel.	The mayor of Key West and two towing companies opposed deauthorization.
75019	IWW, Miami-Key West, Fla.	6,218 (1963)	Channel construction.	The Monroe County board of commissioners opposed deauthorization.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
74616	Camelsback Dam, Ariz.	$ 28,400 (1976)	Clear channel and build earth dam.	The Graham County board of supervisors opposed deauthorization.
74653	Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.	1,015 (1963)	Channel widening and dredging.	Orange County Harbors, Beaches, and Parks District opposed deauthorization.
06510	Gila and Salt Rivers, Gillespie Dam to McDowell Damsite, Ariz.	5,834 (1981)	Flood control measures.	Maricopa County board of supervisors opposed deauthorization.
01011	Noyo River and Harbor Breakwater, Calif.	5,780 (1981)	Breakwater for outer harbor.	Continued local interest. Currently not eligible because the project is being funded.
74698	Santa Cruz County Shore Protection, Calif.	1,690 (1973)	Beach fill, seawalls, and groin construction.	Continued local interest. Currently being restudied.
72273	East Fork and Dry Fork Lakes, Mo.	20,900 (1969)	Flood control for Excelsior Springs, Mo.	The mayor of Excelsior Springs and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources opposed deauthorization. The Corps has requested funds for fiscal year 1983 to start a restudy to determine if an environmentally acceptable and economically feasible flood control plan can be formulated.
74974	Lee County, Fla.	3,250 (1969)	Beach erosion control measures.	District officials have not yet requested funds to do a review because they indicated that the project has strong local support.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
00044	Preston Drainage and Levee District, Ill.	$ 1,064 (1975)	Seepage control measures.	Local interests indicated further study was needed.
74986	Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing, Ill.	7,356 (1981)	Construction of pumping station.	Same as above.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Deauthorization action deferred pending restudy

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
74396	Ponce Harbor and Breakwater, P.R.	$ 4,626 (1977)	Breakwater and other harbor improvements.	Project was being studied under a Corps survey in 1974. Currently not eligible because portions of the project received funds in 1980.
74397	Ponce Harbor-Manuever Area, P.R.	c/	Deepening channel.	Project was being studied under a Corps survey in 1974. Corps is currently considering modifications to the project to include it as part of the Ponce Harbor and Breakwater project.
74379	Miami River-Miami Harbor, Fla.	c/	Widening the mouth of the Miami River and channel.	In 1974 this project was being studied. Currently not eligible because project is continuing to be studied.
74400	St. Thomas Harbor, V.I.	c/	Deepen channel and increase anchorage spaces.	Same as above.
74395	Guayanes Harbor, P.R.	c/	Same as above.	In 1970 this project was being studied. It is currently not eligible because the project is continuing to be studied.
74648	Aliso Creek Lake, Calif.	340 (1954)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Currently not eligible because the project is continuing to be studied.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
74658	San Juan Dam, Orange County Santa Ana River Basin, Calif.	$ 5,960 (1954)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Currently not eligible because the project is continuing to be studied.
75661	Trabuco Dam, Orange County Santa Ana River Basin, Calif.	2,190 (1954)	Same as above.	Same as above.
16330	Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.	3,440 (1969)	Modifications to the entrance channel, turning basin, and breakwaters.	Project was being studied by another Corps program. It is currently eligible but has not yet been reviewed. A second study is planned before considering deauthorization.
74694	Pajaro River (Carnadero Creek), Calif.	1,250 (1980)	Construction of a levee and reconstruction of existing levee.	Currently not eligible because the project received funds in 1975.
74690	Napa River, Calif.	146 (1954)	Deepening, widening, and straightening channel.	Project was included in another study. Currently not eligible because it continues to be studied.
74695	Salinas River, Calif.	8,090 (1954)	Channel improvements and bank protection works.	Project was included in another study. Currently eligible but another study is planned before considering deauthorization.
74456	Roanoke River, N.C.	234 (1954)	Channel improvements.	Project is being studied under another Corps program.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
74459	Wilmington, Harbor Channel widening NC 133 Bridge to Hilton Bridge, N.C.	$ 360 (1954)	Channel widening and deepening turning basin.	Project is being studied under another Corps program and is awaiting congressional action on the survey.
74440	AIWW Tidal Lock in Snow Cut between Myrtle Sound and Cape Fear River, N.C.	1,750 (1954)	Construction of a lock.	Project was studied in 1974 under the Carolina beaches navigation study. A second study is planned before considering deauthorization.
74921	Neodesha Lake, Kans.	18,100 (1954)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Project is being reconsidered under the Verdigris River Basin survey.
72271	Braymer Lake, Mo.	32,400 (1968)	Same as above.	Corps is awaiting results of the Grand River Basin study. Currently eligible for deauthorization.
72274	East Muddy Creek Channel, Mo.	342 (1973)	Channel improvements.	Same as above.
72278	Lower Grand River Channel, Mo.	31,690 (1980)	Excavate and improve existing channel and construct a new levee.	Same as above.
72281	Upper Grand River Channel, Mo.	11,740 (1973)	Excavate and improve existing channel, alter two railroad bridges, and construct new levee.	Same as above.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
72280	Trenton Lake, Mo.	$ 68,000 (1971)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Corps is awaiting results of the Grand River Basin study. Currently eligible for deauthorization.
14160	Platte River Channel, Mo.	11,080 (1973)	Enlarging river and constructing cutoffs.	Eligible at the end of 1981. Restudy funds were requested for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 but as yet no funds have been received.
16970	Smithville Channel, Mo.	88,590 (1980)	Straighten and clear channel.	Scheduled to be restudied, but no funds have been requested.
75008	Mill Lake, Mo.	21,700 (1978)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Same as above.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Deauthorization review needed, scheduled, or ongoing

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
74390	St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.	$ 3,138 (1979)	Deepening harbor and basin.	District officials recommended project for further study.
74386	St. Augustine Harbor, Fla.	c/	Corstruction of a jetty.	District officials recommended project for further study. Currently not shown as eligible but should be. District officials believe that if present erosion trends continue, the project will be needed.
74434	Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	c/	Deepening inner harbor and turning basin.	District officials recommended project for further study. Currently not eligible because project received funds in fiscal year 1979.
74398	San Juan, P.R.	c/	Beach control measures for certain San Juan beaches.	District officials recommended project be further studied. Currently not included on the eligibility list but should be. District officials said that they are now requesting funds for the project.
74439	AIWW Peltier Creek, N.C.	51 (1956)	Channel extension.	Deauthorization review scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 1982.
75087	Ocracoke Island Village Shore, N.C.	56 (1971)	Restoration and stabilization of water frontage and other beach improvements.	Deauthorization review scheduled for fiscal year 1982. However, district officials said they had received no funds to conduct deauthorization reviews in fiscal year 1982.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
13090	Ocracoke Island Hurricane Protection, Hyde County, N.C.	$ 7,880 (1971)	Protection of ocean frontage from hurricane and erosion damage.	Deauthorization review scheduled for fiscal year 1982. However, district officials said they had received no funds to conduct deauthorization reviews in fiscal year 1982.
00034	Alton Commercial Harbor, Ill.	279 (1960)	Channel dredging.	Further study needed once Lock and Dam 26 is completed.
72269	Garnett Lake, Kans.	38,600 (1969)	Construction of a dam and reservoir.	Deauthorization review was scheduled for fiscal year 1981, but the district received no funds. Review was rescheduled for fiscal year 1982. Corps has no funds currently to complete the review.
14020	Pinal Creek, Ariz.	4,150 (1973)	Construction of a channel.	District officials recommended that the project be studied further.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Authorization continued by congressional resolution

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b)	Project description	Comments
		(000 omitted)		
74399	Christiansted Harbor (25-foot channel), V.I.	$ 1,412 (1954)	Deepening channel and turning basins.	Corps recommended deauthorization. Project authorization was continued by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee resolution on July 27, 1977.
74394	Fajardo Harbor, P.R.	241 (1945)	Same as above.	Same as above.
74369	Hudson River, Fla.	1,164 (1973)	Channel deepening and widening from the Gulf of Mexico to the head of the Hudson River.	Same as above.
74383	Palm Beach Side Channel and Basin, Fla.	280 (1946)	Construction of a channel from the Palm Beach Harbor through Lake Worth Inlet to an anchorage in Lake Worth.	Same as above.
74686	Humboldt Bay, Buhne Point, Calif. (shore protection)	300 (1962)	Construction of a seawall.	The Humboldt County board of supervisors opposed deauthorization, but Corps officials recommended deauthorization because there was no prospect that required local cooperation would be forthcoming. However, project authorization was continued by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee resolution on July 27, 1977.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
74689	Lower San Francisco Bay, Calif.	$ 710 (1954)	Channel dredging.	District officials recommended deauthorizing the project because of the lack of local interest. However, project authorization was continued by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee resolution on July 27, 1977.
12940	Noyo River and Harbor, Calif. (Mooring Basin)	9,870 (1979)	Channel extension and construction of a mooring basin.	District officials recommended deauthorizing a portion of the project because it was constructed by local interests with funds received from the State and the Economic Development Administration. However, project authorization was continued by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee resolution on July 27, 1977.
74441	AIWW, New River Channel to Jacksonville, N.C.	267 (1954)	Construction of a channel.	Corps officials recommended deauthorizing the project in 1974 because it was not economically justified. However, project authorization was continued by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee resolution on July 27, 1977.

APPENDIX I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

(085626)

Recommendation withdrawn by the Chief of Engineers

Project reference number (note a)	Project name	Project cost (note b) (000 omitted)	Project description	Comments
00628	Agriculture Area 12, Mo.	$ 2,902 (1976)	Raising and enlarging an existing levee and drainage structure.	District officials recommended deauthorization, although the Missouri Department of Conservation and Natural Resources opposed deauthorization. Thus, the Chief of Engineers removed the project from the list recommended to the Congress.
00049	Sandy Slough, Mo.	601 (1975)	Restoring the slough to suitable water depths for pleasure boating.	District officials considered comments received from one interested party but decided to recommend deauthorization because there was no entity capable of providing local assurances. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources notified the Chief of Engineers that it did not concur with deauthorization. Thus, the Chief of Engineers removed the project from the list recommended to the Congress.

a/Project names listed here will not always be the same as the name in the authorizing legislation.

b/Estimated cost and the year it was made. In many instances, they are "ballpark" estimates and are outdated. Preparing updated and detailed estimates would likely result in significant changes to amounts shown.

c/Estimates are not readily available.

APPENDIX I